

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending in the application and are rejected. The rejection is made final.

The Applicants thank Examiner Campbell for his time and courtesy in conducting a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney. The interview was held on October 13, 2004, during which the undersigned attorney presented reasons why the Applicants traversed the rejection of the claims. An agreement was reached that the rationale given in the Office Action to reject the claims had been successfully traversed; however, the Examiner indicated he believed the prior art of record might be applied differently to reject at least some of the claims. On October 25, the undersigned attorney telephoned the Examiner to explain the Applicants intended to file a Request for Continued Examination so that new claims could be presented for examination. The substance of the interview held on October 13, 2004 is summarized in the following remarks.

Claims 1-27

The Office Action indicates claims 1, 5-8, 10, 14-17, 19 and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 6,029,182 (referred to as "Nehab"), and that claims 2-4, 9, 11-13, 18 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Nehab in view of U.S. patent 5,649,186 (referred to as "Ferguson").

Reasons given in the Office Action to support the rejection of the claims rely on text in cols. 8-10 of Nehab. Applicants traverse the rejection of these claims and respectfully submit that the text relied on in Nehab does not teach all of what is alleged in the Office Action.

Nehab discloses a system for generating a custom formatted newspaper by retrieving articles and formatting the articles' content according to a personal-news-profile. Although alternative embodiments are disclosed (see col. 7 lns. 3-12), the basic operation of the disclosed invention "remains the same: the news retrieval system traverses a hypermedia document on the Web, extracts data according to user-defined information, and formats the data into a personalized newspaper" (col. 7 lns. 13-16).

The text in Nehab from col. 10 ln. 45 to col. 12 ln. 37 provides a detailed description of the processes used to traverse hypermedia documents and extract data according to user-defined rules (a summary also is provided in col. 6 lns. 31-37). The text in col. 12 lns. 38-62 describes the processes used to format the extracted data into a personalized newspaper (a summary also is provided in col. 6 lns. 58-66).

Referring to steps shown in Fig. 5B, Nehab describes the basic operation of the disclosed invention as follows:

... in the case that a user's computer is continuously supplied with power, the Web news retrieval system can be launched automatically at a designated time. The system will retrieve articles from the Web sites which are listed in the personal-news-profile 19. Upon retrieving the news articles, the articles will be formatted based on the newspaper template in the personal-news-profile 19. The formatted personalized newspaper can then be either printed or stored for later viewing. (col. 10 lns. 25-33)

Once personal-news-profile 19 has been created, the Web news retrieval system, upon being launched, can traverse Web news sites and build a personalized newspaper by automatically retrieving various news articles from the Web news sites and print the news articles based on the newspaper template indicated in the personal-news-profile 19. (col. 10 lns. 36-41)

As may be seen from this text, web traversal and data extraction is done according to a user profile after that profile is created. Nehab explains that this profile may include rules based on web site contents (col. 6 lns. 30-34). A user creates and edits his or her own profile using a personal-news-profile editor 16 (see Fig. 4), which is described in the text from col. 7 ln. 22 to col. 10. ln. 44). Processes performed by the editor are illustrated in Figs. 5A-5B.

The text cited in the Office Action, which is relied on to reject the claims, is directed solely to the use of the profile editor. Within this cited text, descriptions of data retrieval and presentation do not describe activities that are performed at that time but merely describe prospective activities, described later in Nehab in more detail, that will use the profile information that is setup and maintained by the profile editor.

Claim 1

The system and methods that are described in Nehab differ from what is claimed. Method claim 1, for example, reads as follows (letters have been added to the steps for convenient reference in the following discussion):

1. A method for providing a personalized presentation of news and information to a recipient comprising steps that perform the acts of:

- (a) obtaining preferences of the recipient, wherein the preferences include an indication of one or more preferred categories and a preferred presentation layout;

- (b) identifying a plurality of documents each having content deemed to satisfy one or more criteria with respect to the one or more preferred categories;

- (c) generating a list of entries in which each entry corresponds to a respective document in the plurality of documents and delivering an indication of the list to the recipient;

(d) receiving from the recipient an indication of selected entries in the list of entries selected by the recipient and identifying one or more selected documents corresponding to the selected entries;

(e) obtaining content information that represent at least part of the content of each selected document; and

(f) generating a representation of articles including the content information such that a presentation of the representation conforms to the preferred presentation layout.

Applicants respectfully submit that Nehab does not disclose or suggest at least steps (c), (d) and (e).

Step (c)

After the claimed method has identified a plurality of documents with content deemed to satisfy one or more recipient-specified criteria, step (c) generates an indication of these documents and delivers the indication to the recipient. This is neither disclosed nor suggested in Nehab.

The Office Action relies on the text in col. 9 to support the assertion that Nehab does disclose step (c). Applicants respectfully disagree. Although Nehab may identify documents or articles based on content, this identification occurs only during the retrieval phase (see col. 10 ln. 45 to col. 12 ln. 37). The process disclosed in Nehab does not identify documents based on content until document retrieval occurs (see especially col. 12 lns. 5-13). The only “indication” of these documents or articles that is delivered to the user is the “extracted data tree” that is subsequently flattened and formatted (see col. 12 ln. 5 to col. 12 ln. 45). The “extracted data tree” in Nehab may correspond to the “content information” that is recited in steps (e) and (f) of the claimed method but it does not correspond to the “indication” recited in step (c).

Step (d)

In step (d), the recipient selects certain ones of the plurality of documents having content deemed to satisfy one or more recipient-specified criteria. This is neither disclosed nor suggested in Nehab.

The Office Action indicates this step is anticipated by the “format editor [that] gives the user the ability to decide which articles are to be placed in the newspaper and how they are to be laid out in the template.” Applicants believe it is clear the format editor and its use cannot anticipate or even suggest step (d) because it is used to setup a format template prior to the actual retrieval (or identification) of documents or articles having appropriate content. The results achieved by the format editor in Nehab may correspond to the generation of representation that is recited in step (f) but it does not correspond to the results obtained by step (d).

Step (e)

In step (e), the claimed method obtains the documents selected by the recipient from a plurality of documents deemed to have appropriate content. This is neither disclosed nor suggested in Nehab.

The Office Action relies on the text in col. 9 to support the assertion that Nehab does disclose step (e). Applicants respectfully disagree. Although the method in Nehab may retrieve documents or articles based on content, this retrieval is not responsive to user selections from a plurality of documents known to have appropriate content (see col. 10 ln. 45 to col. 12 ln. 37).

Other Claims

The reasons discussed above for claim 1 apply to independent claims 10 and 19. All other claims are dependent on one of these independent claims and recite additional limitations; therefore, they are patentable over the cited art for these reasons as well as for additional reasons pertinent to the additional limitations.

New Claims 31-40

As shown above, the Applicants cancel pending claims 1-27 and present new claims 31-40 for examination.

CONCLUSION

Applicants amend the claims as shown above and request continued examination.

Respectfully submitted,



David N. Lathrop
Reg. No. 34,655
601 California St., Suite 1111
San Francisco, CA 94108-2805
Telephone: (415) 989-8080
Facsimile: (415) 989-0910